

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2007-JAN-16 AT 5:00 P.M.,  
BEBAN PARK SOCIAL CENTRE LOUNGE, 2300 BOWEN ROAD**

---

**Present:**

Gail Adrienne	David Hill-Turner
Brian Anderson	Councillor Bill Holdom
Carey Avender	Shirley Lance
Stu Donaldson	Darwin Mahlum
Chris Erb	Ralph Meyerhoff
Bill Forbes	Gord Turgeon
Jolyon Brown	Michael Schellinck

**Staff**

Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning & Development  
Ted Swabey, General Manager, Development Services  
Dale Lindsay, Manager, Current Planning  
Deborah Jensen, Planner, Community Planning  
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

**Regrets:** Edwin Deas Jane Gregory

**Public:** Approximately 200 members of the public were present.

**1. Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair B. Holdom at 5:11 pm.

B. Holdom gave an overview of the role of the Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee (PNAC), and the review process.

A. Tucker advised that another public meeting will be held on these applications at 5:00 pm on 2007-Feb-27, in the Beban Park Lounge.

**2. Adoption of Minutes for 2006-Nov-21:**

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that the PNAC Minutes from 2006-Nov-21 be adopted as presented. CARRIED.

**3. Presentations:**

A. Tucker gave a brief explanation of each of the applications as they were presented.

All applications are available for viewing at [www.nanaimo.ca](http://www.nanaimo.ca).

---

1.	<b><i>Cable Bay Lands Inc.</i></b>	<b>950 Phoenix Way 960 Phoenix Way 1170 Phoenix Way 1260 Phoenix Way 1270 Phoenix Way ≈ 208.5 ha (515.2 ac.)</b>	<b>Amend land use designation from 'Rural Resource' to 'Suburban Neighbourhood' and a new 'Resort Centre' designation. The proposal is to develop a golf course, town centre, marina, and broad range of residential housing ranging from single family dwellings to multiple family and high rise condominiums.</b>
----	--	--	--

---

A presentation was given by Glenn Brower, Project Manager Cable Bay Lands.

**Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:**

- Proposed density of 2200 units at 4.6 units per acre.
- Will include an 18-hole golf course.

- 50% of the property will be left as open area, including the golf course.
- Planning on having the access off of the Duke Pt. Highway. Also looking at access through Crown lands. This will be resolved prior to this proposal going to Council.
- The mix of residential units will have to be determined by market study. The overall concept will be similar to the Bear Mountain development.
- Have been asked to provide an economic impact study to the City and will be doing that.
- The Duke Pt. line, which is a large underutilized water line, can be used for water supply. Regarding septic, Harmac has shown some interest in providing some sewer in joint venture with the RDN and other private partners.
- The advantage to the City in moving the UCB is the tourism aspect of having a golf course and resort destination. There is no other large draw tourist attraction in the City and could work in conjunction with the NNC and cruise ship line. Would provide a commercial spin-off with an increased tax base. Each unit would provide DCCs to the City.
- An additional benefit to the City is that the Duke Pt. water line would be maximized. The sewage facility at Harmac would be used and therefore not add to the City's system.
- 200,000 sq.ft. of commercial is proposed including the club-house. Restaurants and boutiques are also planned.
- The plan is to be as self-contained as possible to minimize the traffic strain on the City. May include some recreation facilities as well as a local service station and grocery store.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- There is no guarantee that services won't be connected to the City.
- If not able to connect to the Duke Pt. Highway, the project will have to be drastically altered.
- 2,200 to 2,400 units in total are planned, which would total approximately 6,000 residents.
- Engineers are doing a study regarding the sewage treatment and Harmac is looking at capacity. That information is required before the proposal can proceed.
- The developer does not plan to interfere with the Cable Bay pathway.
- Was not aware that the City is planning to increase its future water storage facilities because of concern over changing weather patterns and possible water shortage.
- The proposed housing mix would be market driven and currently there is no provision for low income or low cost housing.
- Will take under advisement that low cost housing should be looked at.
- Regarding ocean front access, the entire 3,200 ft of beach front will have a path that will be accessible to the public, up to Joan Point. Will meet the City standard for the path – 2m surface on 3m right-of-way.
- The whole property is owned by a single group. There are no options to buy.
- If access does not come from the Duke Pt. Highway this project could revert back to the current allowable five-acre parcels. Will also work with the City and RDN on access issues.
- Are already conferring with Ministry of Transportation (MOT) and don't know how long it will take for their decision to be made.
- Blue area on map is for the marina. Access will have to be through Leask Road with secondary access points from Ivor Road, Nicola Road, Barnes Road and Lindsay Road.
- The marina is currently not part of the business plan, just part of the design concept. Have been talking to City staff about the possibility of putting in the marina.
- If and when this application goes to Council, all information will be complete and meetings will be held with concerned residents. The applicant wants to address as many issues as possible before going to Council.
- The proponent is a Calgary company formed specifically for this project.
- The company owners' previous developments are in Alberta and Ontario.

- There are a total of six high rise buildings planned. Other buildings would be a maximum of four storeys.
- The public marina proposed would have 200 slips.
- Have done environmental studies on the project proposed to date. Another environmental study would be needed to get approval for the marina.
- All the studies will be provided to the City and will become public documents.

Additional comments from the public:

- There will be a lot of opposition if the road is connected to a local road instead of the Duke Pt. Highway.
- Would go against all of the OCP's aims and policies just so a lot of people from outside could move here.
- Don't think there is a benefit to the City in this proposal.
- This is a flawed process - discussing moving the UCB at the same time the OCP Review is taking place. Should suspend this process until the Review has been completed and allow five years into the new OCP before accepting any applications to change the UCB.
- Disagree that the OCP Review and OCP amendment application process should run together and feel they need to be separated. The Regional District of Nanaimo's Growth Management Plan will also be affected. Don't care what the proposals are about, it is about quality of life and developers need to respect that.
- Need input from the community about what they want their city to look like before considering these developments.
- Water has new meaning today, and as the proposed water supply for this development is coming from the City, there is a limit to the supply and it is of significant concern to Nanaimo residents.
- There is not enough low-cost housing and people who work at this development won't be able to afford the housing. Young people of Cedar need housing and that should be addressed.
- The proposed waterfront path will not be wide enough for multi-use.
- Access for this many people is of great concern because MOT has a poor record of maintaining roads in Cedar.
- Will have a huge impact on Cedar residents, along with the other development proposal on the South Nanaimo lands. Don't see any quality of life or social impact studies being done here.
- How far will the marina be from the bottom of Leask Road? Leask Road is a little country road with families and a quiet area and is not appropriate for the development's marina access.
- A number of Cedar residents have set up an organization called SOS (Save Our Strategy) and information is available on the web at [sosnanaimo.org](http://sosnanaimo.org).
- The political boundary includes these lands in Nanaimo but geographically they are located in the Cedar area. Thinks the Growth Management Strategy should be followed as to where this type of development should go.

Additional comments from PNAC:

- Waiting for information from the applicants on what the benefits would be to the City.
- Have discussed the issue of keeping the OCP amendment and 10 Year Review processes separate. However, we need to know what applications are out there so we know what we are facing. That view has prevailed. As the OCP is also governed by the Regional Growth Management Plan (GMP) the Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) will also be involved.
- Any guarantee that access from the Duke Pt. Highway would not go through Cedar would be up to the MOT.
- Anyone can submit an application to amend the OCP. There are no minimum standards but there is a long list of things an applicant needs to do to complete an application.

Usually applications are not this significant. This meeting was set because of public reaction to the applications and is a standard element of PNAC's review process.

- Council will not see any of the applications until PNAC has finished reviewing them and makes their recommendation. More public meetings will be held on these applications before the process is completed. Upcoming meetings are listed at [www.nanaimo.ca](http://www.nanaimo.ca).
- The City has to determine if there is enough water for this type of development and won't approve it if it will overtax the water supply.
- The City has to follow the *Local Government Act* including the receipt and processing of OCP amendment applications.
- Snuneymuxw First Nation (SFN) will need to be consulted as to whether they were given the right by the B.C. Government to cede the shores in this area.

Additional comments from staff:

- Response from MOT when received, could be posted on City website. Application information can be viewed at any time.
- Have received a request through the RDN to hold a public meeting in Cedar on this application and will let the public know when a date has been set through advertisements.
- Some of the information received in relation to an application is proprietary and is between the applicant and agencies. It is not possible to post the entire application on the web for the public.
- Any input the public wishes to make to the City can also be submitted by mail, phone or through the City's website. Additional meetings will also be held.

---

2.	<b>783371 BC Ltd.</b>	<b>4700 Hammond Bay Rd ≈ 1.1 ha (2.9 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal to develop a gas bar at this address. Policies within the Hammond Bay Neighbourhood Plan specifically exclude gas stations from local service centre within that area.</b>
----	---------------------------	---	--

---

Maureen Pilcher, agent for applicant, gave a presentation.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- Have not had a formal meeting with the neighbourhood but have spoken with some surrounding residents. Will be holding a public information meeting before going to Council. This is a first look at the proposal and wanted to see what changes needed to be made before taking it to the neighbourhood, prior to PNAC's next public session.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- The property is in a Local Service Centre designation which does not mention gas stations. However, the neighbourhood plan for this area does not allow service stations at this site.
- Any sign placed on the property has to meet existing sign bylaw regulations.
- Would like to work with the neighbourhood - don't want to erect signage that isn't acceptable.
- Will have double walled in-ground tanks.
- Will work with the Parks Dept. on walkway improvements and protecting Walley Creek.
- There will be a walking trail at the back of the property available to the community.
- Have not done a door-to-door poll but will be doing so with residents within 500 metres.
- Co-op wants to make this a neighbourhood community area with a post office, video outlet, grocery store and gas bar, along the lines of a small neighbourhood convenience centre. The gas bar is needed for financial viability.
- The gas station will be located behind the store, with lots of landscaping installed.

- The setback from the creek will be at least 30m which more than meets Ministry of Environment requirements.
- Have had a geotech assessment of the site and the project will meet all the requirements. The development will be constructed to the highest standards and tanks will be well away from Walley Creek.
- Will be working with a landscape architect to ensure sufficient screening from Hammond Bay Road and the neighbourhood, using native vegetation.
- Store hours for this site have yet to be determined. If hours are an issue with residents, Co-op will take that into consideration. Co-op's other locations are usually open from 6 a.m. to 11 or 12:00 midnight. Will not be open the same hours as the pub.
- Will have shadow lighting that will shine down and not be wide spread.
- The buffer zone from Hammond Bay will be at least 12m with intensive landscaping installed.
- The project will more than meet buffer requirements for this zone and also include intensive landscaping to adjoining properties.
- The size of the store has not changed since the original proposal, just the addition of the gas bar. This won't be a destination gas station but will serve the local neighbourhood. Will be well maintained and well run.
- The development will not encroach on the ESA.
- Regarding gas tanks, regulations are updated all the time and these tanks are safer today than above-ground tanks. They are monitored constantly and automatically shut down if there is a problem. Fuel cannot be pumped if there is any problem with the tanks. Tanks are also tested on a daily basis, morning and night, monitored manually monthly and records have to be kept for the Ministry of Environment. Have oil-water separators that are maintained annually. Can assure the public that Co-op is very sensitive about these issues because they are owned by local residents.
- Not ruling out offering propane sales, but will see if it is wanted by the neighbourhood during public meetings before any decision is made.
- Information on when the neighbourhood meeting will be held will be very well publicized.

Additional comments from the public:

- Live in the neighbourhood and support the concept.
- Neighbourhood does need something like this but wants to make sure it has visual appeal at street level.
- In a 10 km radius there are 13 gas stations and a convenience store, and only 5 km to Woodgrove with gas stations. Feel there are enough for the neighbourhood.
- Prior to the rezoning of Pipers Pub, that land was environmentally sensitive and right on Walley Creek. Gas stations have problems with tanks, and these tanks will be too close to the creek which the City has just spent a lot of money enhancing.
- Would like to see the site replanted with significant trees native to the environment.

Additional comments from staff:

- A neighbourhood plan provides more detailed information to the OCP but does not override the OCP. As a neighbourhood plan is part of the OCP, a change would need to be made to the OCP to allow the addition of a gas station to the local service centre.

---

<b>3.</b>	<b><i>John Salmon</i></b>	<b>141 Westwood Rd ≈ 1.3 ha (3.4 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal to include the property within the UCB and to redesignate the property as “Suburban Neighbourhood”.</b>
-----------	---------------------------	---	---

---

Staff noted that this property was inside the UCB in the City’s previous OCP (1987) but was moved outside the UCB in Plan Nanaimo (1996). This may have been due to a mapping error.

The applicants were present to answer any questions from PNAC or the public but no formal presentation was given.

Answer from the applicant in response to a question from PNAC:

- The property now belongs to three family members but the property cannot be divided between the families or rezoned as it now stands.

---

<b>4.</b>	<b><i>Nanaimo Shipyard Ltd. (Randy Regier, Newcastle Quay Developments)</i></b>	<b>1020 Stewart Ave 1040 Stewart Ave 1100 Stewart Ave 1110 Stewart Ave ≈ 0.5 ha (1.3 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal for comprehensive development to incorporate walkway, marina, seniors independent living, commercial, pedestrian plaza, underground parking, and hotel and residential suites (these within two high rise towers).</b>
-----------	---	---	--

---

The architect for the applicant (Abbarch Partnership Architects), gave a presentation.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- A workshop will be held after this meeting to get public comments to incorporate into the development proposal.
- Towers will be 25 to 28 storeys high.
- There will be a total of 300-350 units in both buildings with 5 to 6 units per floor.
- Aware of ferry traffic and volumes. This is a residential project without high commercial activity. Still need to consult with City staff and do traffic impact studies.
- Have to look at viability of current uses and what the City needs in the way of waterfront development and density. The current use in the long term is not as viable as this project will be. This proposal will make a valuable contribution to the City and don’t feel it contradicts Goal One of the OCP.
- It may be out of context with the current neighbourhood make-up, but the developer is thinking long term of what will happen along the waterfront and how this would contribute to the waterfront activity. Towers and densification are for the longer vision of the area.
- Is aware of the history of opposition to high-rises in Nanaimo but the developer feels confident this is the way to proceed.
- Current zoning allows four-storey buildings with a mix of residential and marina activity.
- Will be looking at sustainable design and embrace as many LEED policies as possible.
- Public consultation will be the next step with a workshop to get feedback to pass on to staff and Council. Will be done as quickly as possible.
- Looking for comprehensive development zoning.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- Have not started the public process yet so don’t know how the public feels about the proposal.
- The hotel component size would depend on market studies.
- The marina will have approximately 150 slips.
- The buildings will be taller than the current Stewart Avenue average.
- Proposing a signalized intersection at St. George if that is approved by MOT.

- Feel this development compliments other towers towards the downtown and float plane areas. Bosa's building will be taller.
- Will hold a public workshop in a public facility and display all of the slides. Questionnaires will be handed out asking what are the good and bad points of the project and how to improve the design. Will be advertised and perhaps have mail outs.
- Not sure if any of the moorage will be covered.
- The issue of blocked views will be dealt with at the workshop to get feedback from public.
- Will do an environmental impact study in terms of water and sewer. Do not know if this will show the impact, if any, on Newcastle Island.
- Residents of the project will have a view of Newcastle Island.
- Not sure if the seniors independent living units will be subsidized or not. These units are just being considered.
- Affordable housing units could be considered but are not part of what is proposed now.
- Will be doing tests for contaminants and may find some which will have to be removed.
- Have to see what the City requires for environmental studies.
- The core concept of high-rises still gives area residents an ocean view and don't think it will impact local property values.
- Will be talking to the City Engineering Dept. to determine how best to handle traffic from the development and ferries.

Additional comments from the public:

- Newcastle Island is a marine park and we all love it. Consider a smaller scale development.
- Seems this is going to be a big problem development of the waterfront.

Additional comments from PNAC:

- We need to look at ways to achieve higher density development to stop urban sprawl.

---

<b>5.</b>	<b><i>Wheel Estate Ltd.</i></b>	<b>3518 Hillside Ave ≈ 47.2 ha (116.7 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal to place inside UCB so can be used for residential development.</b>
-----------	---------------------------------	--	---

---

Allan Deering gave a brief presentation and noted:

- Has been trying to get this property out of the UCB for a long time.
- Had to take on shareholders to keep the property and wait for things to change.
- Came up with a plan to cover all aspects but it was turned down by the City because the City refused to spend any money.
- Property has been frozen for 30 years.
- Alpine Village property was sold to the City for parkland - was a loss for investors.
- This property shouldn't be reserve land.
- A road has been proposed through Mr. Heringa's lands which would give access to the property.
- Could extend Tanya Drive. Wasn't able to put up OCP signs because there is no access.

There were no questions to the applicant from PNAC or the public.

---

<b>6.</b>	<b><i>CDF Developments Ltd.</i></b> <b><i>(Hans Heringa)</i></b>	<b>553 Third St</b> <b>≈ 0.8 ha (2.0 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal for multi-family residential.</b>
-----------	---	--	---

---

Rick Singh, representative for the applicant, gave a presentation:

- RM-5 would be a more efficient use of the property.
- There are many facilities close by.
- A four storey building is being proposed.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- Current designation is Neighbourhood with RS-1 zoning.
- RM-5 is too dense for rezoning.
- Believe that the adjacent streets, Hillside and Sperling, are currently built on.
- Access would be off Third Street.
- There is presently a vacant building on the site.
- Would have to do a traffic study to determine if the proposed development would create a traffic problem with similar buildings across the street.
- Approximately 60 units are proposed.
- Units would be 1 and 2 bedroom. Could be suitable for small families.
- More details on the project will be forthcoming.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- Previous proposal to leave as RS-1 and only have single family houses did not work economically.
- Would be possible to put single family along the Hillcrest Avenue frontage and a condo complex backing onto that.
- Has no plans for the existing building.
- The property off Watfield (where the welding businesses are) is a different property. It currently would allow for single family lots.
- Hans Heringa has owned the property for 20 or so years.

---

<b>7.</b>	<b><i>Sound Contracting Ltd. /</i></b> <b><i>Steven Heringa</i></b>	<b>4451 Burma Rd</b> <b>4471 Burma Rd</b> <b>≈ 5.9 ha (14.7 acres)</b>	<b>Proposal to include lands within UCB and provide for multi-family residential.</b>
-----------	--	--	---

---

Rick Singh, representative for the applicant, gave a presentation:

- Water services are available on the property.
- Do not require any additional city services, just better utilization thereof.
- Make use of property with residential.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- Will be cluster-type housing/townhouses with up to 60 to 90 units.
- The size of the property is 5.9 ha (15 ac.).
- Owner is in favour of protecting the creek feeding Cottle Lake by Lost Lake and Lost Creek. Public access connecting the two parks has not yet been discussed.
- The existing zoning allows for 2 single family dwellings per 5 acre parcel.



---

<b>8.</b>	<b><i>CDF Developments Ltd.</i></b> <b><i>(Hans Heringa)</i></b>	<b>2421 Bowen Rd</b> <b>2425 Bowen Rd</b> <b>2429 Bowen Rd</b> <b>≈ 0.4 ha (1.0 acre)</b>	<b>Proposal to develop for multiple family residential (i.e. apartment building).</b>
-----------	---	--	---

---

Presentation was given by Keith Brown, representative for the applicant.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- The difference between this application and previously submitted applications, is that this one is for residential only whereas previous applications were for mixed commercial or office.
- Will consist of 30 to 40 one and two bedroom condos with surface and underground parking. The three storey units will have roof dormers on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor.
- City has raised the issue of access and egress onto Bowen Road. There is enough land to redesign appropriate access.
- Under the current zoning, four single family homes would be permitted.
- Could perhaps do triplexes for twelve units if the property was rezoned.
- Because this property is on a major road and is underutilized, are proposing 30 to 40 units with an OCP amendment rather than 12 with a rezoning.

Additional comments from the public:

- The last application was for a three storey residential building which was turned down by Council. The neighbourhood was strongly opposed to the application.

---

<b>9.</b>	<b><i>Pacific Pet Resorts Inc.</i></b> <b><i>(Maureen Pilcher)</i></b>	<b>6200 Doumont Rd</b>  <b>≈ 2.0 ha (5.0 acres)</b>	<b>Amend land use designation from 'Rural Resource' to 'Neighbourhood' to provide for the development of a multiple-family, affordable housing project.</b>
-----------	---	---	---

---

Presentation was given by Maureen Pilcher, representative for the applicant.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- 30 to 36 two storey family style housing units are proposed. Units will be 1,400 sq ft.
- Will be affordable housing, and will look at finding a sponsor in order for the units to also be subsidized.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- Property was removed from the ALR last year because the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) didn't find it had any ALR potential.
- If any land was put into the ALR to compensate, that would have been required by ALC.
- Regarding community amenities, want to keep it affordable so are looking at some subsidies for things such as playgrounds.
- Would consider including community gardens as that would make the development more desirable, but are not sure the land is suitable. Are also looking at providing a day care center, and will talk to Parks and Recreation about continuing the trail.
- The Parkway will retain its park-like look because the development will not encroach on the character protection zone, in accordance with Parkway Design Guidelines.
- Services exist within the right-of-way of Doumont Road so would hook into those.
- The two to three bedroom town homes with the living area on the bottom floor will be affordable to families.
- Units might be rental or sale.

- As there would be difficulty accessing off of Doumont Road, access into the development will be off Jenkins Road, which will remain a closed road.

---

<b>10.</b>	<b><i>Snuneymuxw First Nation / Northwest Properties (Dillon Consulting)</i></b>	<b>1200 Frew Rd 1560 Island Highway S 1650 Island Highway S ≈ 293.0 ha (724.0 ac.)</b>	<b>Proposal for comprehensive development to incorporate an industrial enterprise area, low-medium residential, medium-high residential, industrial service/research education, and town centre.</b>
------------	--	--	--

---

Aaron Aubin, Dillon Consulting, representative for the applicant gave a presentation:

- A comprehensive plan has been submitted to the City.
- Project consists of a mix of uses in the Town Centre including retail and commercial, and perhaps police and fire protection.
- Low to medium density residential will be developed.
- There will be medium density along Cedar Road.
- The proposal encourages a mix of uses that would support the Town Centre.
- Industrial enterprise area is consistent with current zoning.
- There are two intersections proposed along Cedar Road and three along the Duke Point Highway. Discussing access with the Ministry of Transportation and the City.
- The project will meet the five goals of Plan Nanaimo and the Regional Growth Strategy.
- Will be a complete and viable community and will protect the environment.
- Have engaged with the community in meetings, and will work with stakeholders to get further public input. Met with the Chase River Community Association on January 10, and so far the response has been supportive.
- Will provide many positive additions to the City.
- Is an opportunity for their firm to work together with the SFN and City.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from PNAC:

- There will be 900 residential units, medium to high density residential (30 - 40 units per acre) 2,000 units, Business park 600,000 to 700,000 sq. ft, industrial enterprise designation 400,000 sq.ft., town centre area at 500,00 to 900,000 sq.ft., local service centre at 21,000 sq. ft.
- 4,000 to 5,000 people are anticipated in 1,800 units.
- 300 units per year so will take some years to complete, depends on market demand.
- Will work with the City on ground-truthed inventories of ESAs. May not be aware of some areas and further studies will show them. Will also do an environmental impact study.
- The land availability study being done for the City is close to being completed.
- Upgrading Cedar Road will have to be considered.
- Connecting Cedar Road to the Duke Pt. Highway to take traffic off of Cedar Road is not part of proposal.
- Working with the City to determine availability of services, which will then determine how the development is phased.
- Looking to move inside the UCB first, then will work out details of the project later. Will incorporate public input into more detailed plans.
- Healy Road will have to be considered in the detailed plans. Would try and protect as much of the environment as possible, and ESAs would have to be protected.
- Would reduce industrial service area to research or business park. Do not want industrial across from residential. Looking for something compatible and higher use.

Answers from the applicant in response to questions from the public:

- There are opportunities to include affordable housing, but don't have the detailed design yet.

- Will look at community supports such as social services for homeless and drug problems later in the process.
- Can't speak to previous developers actions with respect to past logging.
- With respect to the carrying capacity of Nanaimo in relation to the growth being proposed, will consider available services in the detailed engineering study being done.
- Regarding food sustainability, there are currently no community gardens or agriculture plans included in the proposal right now but could be considered.
- Storm water drainage will be addressed in a storm water master plan for this development which looks at best practices and incorporating sustainability. This is a preliminary concept to start vision process.
- Have been in discussion with the MOT and the City regarding access to Duke Pt. Highway considering the remoteness and topography of the site.
- This proposal is an equal shareholding partnership between the Snuneymuxw First Nation (SFN) and Northwest Properties. All of the property is fee simple land owned by the SFN and Northwest Properties, under a partnership known as Island Wolf, and is subject to DCCs and taxes.
- This is a comprehensive development, not piece meal, and will present unique opportunities and many different types of uses to the anticipated 5000 new residents.
- Trying to follow sustainability as per the OCP by balancing shopping in the south end of Nanaimo, thereby reducing car trips and refocusing commercial growth in the south end of the City and away from the north.
- Regarding the area on the marsh, the proposal reflects those boundaries that are protected under OCP requirements for wet lands.
- There is some ALR land which is currently being considered for exclusion from the ALR. Are also seeking environmental information from the City and the Ministry of Environment on flood plains.

Additional comment from Snuneymuxw First Nation:

- There is an Estuary Plan that the SFN has been involved with for many years. The piece closest to the river is very important to the SFN.

Additional comments from the public:

- The community is not in favour of more access to the Duke Pt. Highway.
- The business community and industrial community say we are running out of industrial land. Lost industrial land with the large interchange and another proponent tonight is also removing industrial land and this is a concern.

Additional comments from PNAC:

- All proposals are subject to carrying capacity of the City.
- Why use new lands? Why not densify and put value in land already available?
- Negotiations with the applicants will be required to determine what the costs will be to the City for this project.
- It is difficult to predict costs and public benefits for a 10 to 15 year project.
- Review loss of industrial land in the 10 Year OCP Review.
- Regarding what the City's responsibility is in providing due diligence on this application and the Cable Bay application, such as requiring environmental and sustainability studies, there are major challenges but also opportunities.

Additional comments from staff:

- Regarding any tax increases as a result of this project, B.C. Assessment would need to be consulted about any changes in categories. The City would receive more taxes from any higher use.

- With regard to the time frame of the OCP Review and consideration of these applications, the intent is to include decisions by PNAC and the 10 Year Review as part of the decision making process. The original timeline did not anticipate 10 applications - this is the first time for this many applications since the Plan was adopted, but will try and dovetail the two processes.
- There will be another meeting on February 27<sup>th</sup> for public input on these applications. There will also be workshops on the UCB and densification as part of the OCP Review.
- Two process are running parallel.
- The first draft of the new OCP won't come out until the workshops are concluded.

---

**11. *Jingle Pot Residents***
**Application not yet received.**


---

The Chair deferred this discussion to the 10 Year Review process.

---

**12. *City of Nanaimo  
Housekeeping  
Amendments***
**1. Development Permit Area 21**
**Amendment to Subsection 8.2.21.5 to clarify the exemptions for a form and character development permit.**
**2. Development Permit Area 23 & Schedule B**
**Amendment to clarify the 30 metre setback requirements for portions of Cottle Creek and wetlands, and the lower Chase River.**


---

The Chair deferred these amendments to the 10 Year Review process.

**4. Next Meeting:**

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2007-Feb-20, Board Room, City Hall. Another public meeting to review the OCP amendment applications is scheduled for 2007-Feb-27, 5:00 p.m., Beban Park Lounge.

**5. Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.